	Case 1:02-cv-06316-AWI-DLB Document 76 Filed 06/10/05 Page 1 of 2
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	JONATHON MORGAN, CASE NO. CV-F-02-6316 AWI DLB P
12	Plaintiff,FURTHER ORDER RE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL
13	vs. [Doc. 63]
14	DURAN, et al.,
15	Defendants.
16	
17	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in a civil rights action
18	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendants answered the second amended complaint upon which thi
19	action proceeds on January 3, 2005 and the Court issued an order opening discovery on January 26
20	2005. On April 12, 2005, the Court issued an Order regarding plaintiff's motion to compel production
21	of documents which was filed on March 14, 2005. The Court found that the investigative report
22	relating to the August 8, 2002 incident were relevant to plaintiff's claims. Because defendants made
23	privilege claim, the Court ordered defendants to submit the documents to the Court for in camera review
24	On May 11, 2005, defendants filed a response to the Court's order indicating that they had made
25	mistake and in fact there were no investigative reports for the August 8, 2002 incident. Plaintiff file
26	a reply requesting that defendants be sanctioned for withholding documents.
27	Plaintiff's request for sanctions is denied. The Court must accept defendants' representaiton that

documents responsive to the discovery requests do not exist. Defendants and their counsel are aware

## Case 1:02-cv-06316-AWI-DLB Document 76 Filed 06/10/05 Page 2 of 2 of their disclosure obligations in this case and the consequences of failing to comply. There is nothing to suggest that defendants have not been forthcoming in their response to the Court. Plaintiff's motion to compel further production of documents is therefore DENIED as moot. IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/ Dennis L. Beck UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE Dated: <u>June 10, 2005</u> 3b142a